Page 12

LAKE012

REMARKS

Status of the Application:

Claims 1-51 are the claims of record of the application. Claims 1-51 have been subject to a restriction requirement.

The examiner has stated that the restriction requirement of August 4, 2005 is being replaced by a new restriction requirement, and that the Office Action of October 19, 2005 is vacated.

Vacating of Previous Office Action(s)

The examiner has stated that the restriction requirement of August 4, 2005 is being replaced by a new restriction requirement, and that the Office Action of October 19, 2005 is vacated.

The January 7, 2005 Office Action is also assumed to be vacated, and Applicants' response to the January 7, 2005 Office Action is also vacated because it is based on an election of a species according to a vacated restriction requirement.

New Election/Restrictions

- Species I shown in Figs. 7 and 9; corresponding claims are asserted to be 1-5, 7, 8, 20-30, 36-49, 50, 51 (unique-to-species claims 20-30, 50, 51).
- Species II shown in Figs. 3 and 4; corresponding claims are asserted to be 1-5,
 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 36-49 (unique-to-species claims 9, 10, 11, 12).
- Species III shown in Figs. 3 and 5 or Figs. 7 and 8; corresponding claims are asserted to be 1-4, 6, 13-17, 42-49 (unique-to-species claims 6, 13-17).
- Species IV shown in Fig. 6; corresponding claims are asserted to be 18 and 19 (unique-to-species claims 18 and 19).

Page 13

LAKE012

- Species V shown in Figs. 16 and 19; corresponding claims are asserted to be 31, 32, 33 (unique-to-species claim 33).
- Species VI shown in Figs. 16 and 22; corresponding claims are asserted to be 31, 32, 34 and 35 (unique-to-species claims 34 and 35).

The following claim(s) are asserted to be generic: claims 1-4 and 42-49 are generic to species I, II and III; claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 36-41 are generic to only species I and II; claims 31 and 32 are generic to species V and VI.

Response and Election

As Applicants are required to make an election, <u>Applicants elect Species I with corresponding claims 1-5, 7, 8, 20–30, 36-49, and 50–51 WITH TRAVERSAL</u>.

Amendment to the claims.

The Listing of Claims attached hereto amends the claims of August 8, 2005 (with all restriction requirements prior to the present one vacated), in particular, amends claim 1 to add clarity by more clearly stating that there is a series of audio inputs representing audio signals each being projected from an idealized speaker located at a respective spatial location relative to an idealized listener, and further amends claim 51 to more clearly point out that the accepting of a plurality of input signals representing sound sources, and that the input signals are one of either a stereo pair of left and right audio signals, Dolby AC-3 inputs; a surround sound plurality of inputs including front left, front right, rear left, and rear right audio signals. The claim has also been amended to clearly state that the sound sources include at least one frontal sound portion. The claim has also been amended to state that the reverberant part of the acoustic response produced by the processing is weighted only toward the front of the listener.

Page 14

LAKE012

Examiner's reasoning for the different species is improper

In addition, Examiner's reasoning for the different species is improper, as can be seen from the following arguments for how Species I and Species VI were defined and drawings/claims asserted to be covered.

Species I: In paragraph 4 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of the species I invention is the particular surround sound and a first mixing matrix interconnected to the audio inputs and a series of feedback inputs from a filter system claimed therein.

Only FIG. 7 shows feedback. FIG. 9 does not show any feedback, and therefore, is erroneously stated to be ONLY in species I. It is believed, for example, to read on species II. Furthermore, claim 50 does not mention any feedback paths, and therefore is erroneously included ONLY in Species I. Furthermore, claim 51 does not mention any feedback paths, and therefore is erroneously included ONLY in Species I. These are believed to read, for example, on an embodiment that includes the special feature of Species II.

Species II: In paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of species II invention is the particular AC-3 inputs and the first filter comprising short filter lengths and second filter comprising longer filter lengths claimed therein.

Species III: In paragraph 6 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of species III invention is the particular processing stereo input sound sources claimed therein.

Species IV: In paragraph 7 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of species IV invention is the particular of processing AC-3 input using anti-phase HRTF claimed therein.

Page 15

LAKE012

Species V: In paragraph 8 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of species V invention is the particular first recursive filter structure having a longer reverberation decay time than a second recursive filter structure as claimed therein.

Species VI: In paragraph 9 of the office action, the Examiner states that the special technical feature of species VI invention is the particular series of recursive filter structures interconnected to sum and difference filters claimed therein.

Conclusion

While the Applicants have elected a Species with traversal. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 20-30, 36-49, and 50-51 are the elected claims.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would advance the prosecution and allowance of this application, an email message to the undersigned at dov@inventek.com, or a telephone call to the undersigned at +1-510-547-3378 is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dov Reenfeld, Reg. No. 38687

Address for correspondence:

Dov Rosenfeld 5507 College Avenue, Suite 2, Oakland, CA 94618

Tel. 510-547-3378

Fax: +1-510-291-2985 Email: dov@inventek.com